

The Daily Era can be had every morning at the Periodical Stand of Mr. J. T. BATES, Exchange, Philadelphia; also, the Weekly Era.

Mr. JAMES RALPH is authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements for the Daily and the Weekly National Era, in Cincinnati and vicinity.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1854.

JUDGE DOUGLAS AND THE NEW HAMPSHIRE DEMOCRACY.

POWERS OF A TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE.

The projectors of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise are alarmed at the excitement produced in New Hampshire, lest it may throw that State in the approaching election into the hands of an anti-Administration majority. Edmund Burke, editor of the *New Hampshire Reporter*, avows his approbation of the Bill, but he wishes the People distinctly to understand that the repeal of the Compromise will be equivalent to a re-establishment of Slavery throughout the Territory of Nebraska.

"The Nebraska bill," he says, "if it shall pass both Houses of Congress, repeals the Missouri Compromise. And what will be the effect of such repeal? Unquestionably to revive and re-establish Slavery over that whole region. When Louisiana was ceded to the United States, the law of Slavery existed over that whole vast Territory. It required no law to establish the institution—it then existed in fact and by law. And out of that Territory already three slave States have been carved, and admitted into the Union, viz: Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri. When they came into the possession of the Union as Territories, Slavery had been planted, and was flourishing upon their soil; and the whole Territory of Louisiana was under the dominion of the law which established and legalized the institution. Therefore, when those States came into the Union, the people did not have to establish and ordain Slavery. The Missouri Compromise repealed and excluded the institution above the line of 36° 30' min. The repeal of that Compromise revives and re-establishes Slavery in all the remaining territory of the Louisiana purchase. Therefore, the law which permits Slavery will be revived, and Slavery will exist in Nebraska and Kansas the very moment the Nebraska bill receives the sanction of the President. This is the only deduction which can be logically drawn from the premises."

The law of Slavery being against natural right, and there being no power in the Federal Constitution authorizing the enactment or continuation of such a law, we hold that when Louisiana came under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, whatever laws had prevailed there sustaining Slavery, became that moment, invalid, "null and void." Of course, as we do not admit the premise of the *Reporter*, we repudiate its conclusion—that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise would revive Slavery throughout the Territory.

But, we need hardly say, that our theory of Slavery is not that maintained by the South, acted upon by Congress, and sanctioned by the Supreme Court. According to their theory, the validity of the slave laws of Louisiana was not affected by its transfer to the United States—they continued in force throughout the whole of the Territory. This is the view of nineteenth-century of the politicians of the country. Mr. Douglas included. It is not for them, therefore, to impugn the reasoning of the *New Hampshire Reporter*. If the view be correct, its argument is sound. The Missouri Compromise left undisturbed the law of Slavery in all of the Territory south of 36° 30' min., and suspended it north of that line. If it had been repealed the next Congress, the suspended law would have again become operative—the Territory would have been remanded to its original condition. The delay of the repeal does not affect the principle. To repeal the Law of Freedom in the Territory is to revive the Law of Slavery, suspended by it. Let the Democracy of New Hampshire be admonished that, whatever assurances they may receive to the contrary, this is the argument which slaveholders will urge, should the Compromise be repealed.

Mr. Douglas, in a letter to the editor of the *Reporter*, scents this idea with a great display of indignation, and asks—

"Do you not know that the Southern men deny the constitutional power of Congress to establish Slavery in the Territories? Yet in the teeth of this undeniable fact, which is well known to every man, woman, and child, who has ever read a newspaper, your paper represents these gentlemen, as proposing to violate, not only the Constitution, but their own oath, by voting to establish Slavery in Nebraska and Kansas? After attempting to fix this brand of infamy on the brow of more than two-thirds of the members of the United States Senate, the writer of the article in question proceeds to show the kindness of his heart and the purity of his motives, by assuring your readers that he is no better than those whom he assails, and therefore he approves the act, and advises its consummation."

We cannot allow Mr. Douglas to mystify this question. Southern men do not propose to establish Slavery in the Territories by a positive law of Congress, and therefore his bill embraces no such provision. They insist that Congress shall pass no law to exclude Slavery from the Territories, and therefore his bill contains no such enactment.

Thus far, their course is open and above-board; but here commences the double-dealing. Will the People of a Territory have the right, should the Bill pass, to exclude Slavery? On this vital question the Bill itself is ambiguous, intentionally so, although at first sight it may seem to the uninitiated plain enough. "Intentionally ambiguous," we say, because the authors of the Bill know that the so-called Democrats of the South differ too widely from their associates of the North, in relation to the power of the inhabitants of a Territory in respect to Slavery; so that, when it is sought to unite them in the support of a common measure, involving a question as to this power, it is necessary to frame the terms of the act so that they may stand on two directly opposite constructions. Let us now show how this purpose is accomplished in the Bill under consideration:

"The 14th section declares that the laws of the United States shall be in force in the Territory, with the exception of the Missouri Compromise act."

"Which, being inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the 'Compromise Measures,' is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate

Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

"SUBJECT ONLY TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES." That proviso is the trap in which the North is to be caught. "What!" these noisy politicians cry, in affected surprise, "can you Democrats of the North question the right of the People of a Territory to regulate their own concerns? Does not the Bill recognize their right to exclude Slavery, and will they not exercise it, just as the People of New Hampshire and California have done?"

No! The Bill recognizes no such right. It simply leaves the People of a Territory free to regulate their own institutions in their own way, SUBJECT ONLY TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. We are satisfied with this, say the Southern Democrats, "for the People of a Territory under the Constitution of the United States have no right to exclude Slavery. The Constitution recognizes Slavery, recognizes property in human beings, spreads over this property everywhere within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government the broadegis of its protective power. We ask no legislation from Congress to establish Slavery in the Territories—nay, in the language of Mr. Douglas, we deny the constitutional power of Congress to do so. Such legislation were a work of supererogation; slaves may be carried into any Territory of the United States, and held therein in virtue of the Constitution, and the People of a Territory cannot legislate against it, for that would be against the Constitution, to which their legislation is made 'subject' by this Bill."

We risk nothing in saying that this is the view taken of the question by the so-called Democratic Party of the South. The amendment introduced by Mr. Chase on the 15th inst., is intended to expose the trap in the Bill, to exclude all chance for double-dealing—to bring the North and the South to a common understanding of the phraseology employed. We reprint the foregoing ambiguous provision of the Bill, with the amendment of Mr. Chase, which we enclose in brackets:

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the People thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States; [under which the People of the Territory, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit the existence of Slavery therein.]"

This, remember, is a distinct affirmation of the very doctrine preached at the North by all those so-called Democratic papers and politicians that are laboring to reconcile the Northern People to the support of the Bill. How was it received in the Senate? It disconcerted and perplexed the authors of the Bill.

Mr. Brown, of Mississippi, who had supported the provision as it stands, disclosed frankly the Southern view:

"I have not, in my own judgment, and I trust I have not in my action, yielded the principle that the people of the Territories do, during their Territorial existence, have the right to exclude Slavery. I have not intended to yield that point, and I do not mean that my action, in future times, shall be so construed. As I am not prepared with authorities to go on upon this precise point this evening, I hope that I shall be allowed about fifteen minutes before the vote is taken, when I will have the authorities with me, to give my views upon this point, and this alone."

This brought Mr. Cass to his feet, who said— "The honorable Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Brown] has found on one of the main questions connected with this bill, and which has not been touched upon before. It is a very grave and a very important question. The power of the people of the Territories to legislate upon their internal concerns, during the period of these temporary Governments, is most clearly given in this bill, if the Constitution permits it."

Mr. Badger. Certainly.

Mr. Cass. If the Constitution does not permit, they have not got it.

Mr. Badger. That is clear.

Mr. Cass. Behind that stands the other question, which must be discussed here; and I, for one, am determined that my constituents shall know my views on the point. It is one on which the honorable Senator from Mississippi and myself differ, and have differed radically, but on which, as I trust, we differ, and shall differ, properly. It is whether, by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, there is a kind of motive power in Slavery that immediately spreads it over any Territory, or by virtue of which any slave may be taken to any Territory of the United States, as soon as it is annexed to the Union."

Very well. We hope Mr. Cass will be explicit. Let us have done with ambiguities and dodges. Let the North and South come to a clear understanding of terms, and not try to cheat each other. The amendment of Mr. Chase must be voted upon. It asserts the doctrine which the Northern advocates of the Nebraska bill promulgate at the North, and of course they should insist upon its adoption. If adopted, the South will spurn the bill; for it never has acknowledged, it never will acknowledge, the right of a Territorial Legislature to exclude or prohibit Slavery. We tell the North that it will not be adopted. For whatever the course devised for getting rid of it, the failure to adopt it will stamp with falsehood the assertions of the advocates of the bill in the free States, that it recognizes the right of the People of a Territory to exclude Slavery.

Our exchanges announce the forthcoming of a History of the Origin, Formation, and Adoption of the Constitution of the United States, with sketches of its principal framers, in two volumes 8vo, from the pen of Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, of the Bar of Boston and of the Supreme Court, and one of the literary exponents of Mr. Webster. The courses from which Mr. Curtis has derived the material for his work are said to be original and authentic, viz: the journals of Congress and the public and private letters of the eminent men who assisted to build up our political system.

A resolution in favor of an amendment of the United States Constitution, so that the Supreme Court Judges shall be elected by the people, and hold their offices only eight years, has been adopted with only five negative votes in the Ohio House.

IS THERE AGITATION?

The Legislature of Maine, a Democratic State, has testified against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, by the election of Wm. Pitt Fessenden, a believer in the principles of the Independent Democracy.

The Legislature of Massachusetts, with much unanimity, has passed resolutions against it; Whigs, Old Line Democrats, and Independent Democrats, voting for them.

The Rhode Island Legislature has resolved unanimously against it.

The State Conventions of both the old party in Connecticut have resolved against it.

The Legislature of New York, without distinction of Party, has resolved against it.

The Legislature of Wisconsin has just voted to engross resolutions against it—forty-seven to twenty-six.

Other free States will pursue the same course. The only reason why there is some hesitation at decided action is, that the so-called Democratic politicians dislike to assume an attitude of hostility to the Administration. The People are right, but the Politicians obstruct them.

In the face of all this legislative action, of the powerful protests of the Radical and Conservative, the Religious and Secular, the Whig, Democratic, and Independent Democratic Press of the North, and of the proceedings of the immense meetings throughout the free States, the advocates of the Bill here in Washington affect to believe that there is no excitement among the Northern People—all the demonstrations of opposition to the Bill, they say, are got up by demagogues!

A pretty story, this! The advocacy of the Bill in the Northern States is confined chiefly to that portion of the press which draws its support from the patronage of the Administration, and to those classes of politicians interested directly or indirectly in Government favor.

When we see religious papers, and conservative political papers, that sustained the legislation of 1850; "Silver Grays" and "Hunker Democrats" who have never affiliated with Anti-Slavery men; the Democratic and Whig Journals, independent of Federal influence, and the People, who have no expectation of fat jobs or offices, all protesting against this iniquitous measure, it is simply brazen impudence to pretend that such opposition is the work of demagogues.

Let us assure these Washington politicians that they will see still more formidable demonstrations. As their arts fail them, as the People become fully awakened to the real enormity of the mediated outrage, as the hollowness of the clamor about the right of the inhabitants of a Territory to regulate their own concerns shall be exposed, and as it shall grow more and more manifest that the real intent and effect of the Bill are to exclude all action against Slavery, as well by the Territorial as Federal Legislature, the voice of the People will be heard in still clearer and sterner tones of reprobation.

THE PEOPLE AROUSED.

The meeting at New York last Saturday evening, to protest against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, represented the "bone and sinew of the community." We have been assured by those who were present that five thousand people and more were in attendance. The pro-slavery papers here of course disparage it, but let us hear what the *New York Express* says, a journal not to be suspected of any fondness for Anti-Slavery demonstrations: "The Tabernacle Anti-Nebraska Meeting.—We do not approve of a great many things said at this meeting, especially by the reverend gentlemen, who have the advantage of all the associate editors, in not only writing all the week, but in preaching on Sunday—what we of the laity are not allowed to do; but duty and candor compel us to say, as misrepresentations are sent abroad, that it was a great meeting, a telling meeting, and a meeting which, in our judgment, now best expresses the almost general feeling of the city. It is very true, as is said, that Abolitionists go to such meetings, and use them to spread their special tenets; but it was no Abolition meeting, no Anti-Slavery meeting, in the general meaning of that word, but a meeting held to maintain what the people here believe in—the faith of treaties, of compacts, of compromises."

There now hang up before us an immense handbill, on which we count some three thousand names, calling a Mass Convention of the People of the 20th Congressional District, New York, to meet at Rome, on the 23d February. The signers were obtained within two days, and hundreds more names were handed in too late for the Press. Party distinctions are lost sight of. Among the speakers announced are the Hon. Joshua A. Spencer, the Hon. Timothy Jenkins, and other well-known political men.

A similar meeting was held on the evening of the 17th, at Rochester, in pursuance of a call signed by some thousands of citizens without distinction of party. The Rochester Daily Union says: "The character and political affinities of the officers and others who participated in the proceedings are worthy of passing notice. And we would remark that, notwithstanding all the officers named were not present, every one had been consulted, and approved of the object of the meeting. The Chairman, Hon. John Williams, is the present worthy and popular Mayor of the city. He has all along been claimed as an Abolitionist, and was recently nominated for re-election by that section—a fact which shows he is not chargeable with Anti-Slavery fanaticism. Hon. Messrs. Pitkin, Kempshall, Hastings, Boddy, and Strong, and Messrs. Mumford, Mathews, Rochester, Montgomery, and Gorton, are well known as among the staunchest 'Silver Grays' in this country. The first two gentlemen named have been Mayors of this city; the next, a member of the Legislature; Mr. Boddy, a member of Congress; Mr. Strong, a Judge, &c. Gen. Gould is well known as a Democratic politician, throughout this and other States; Messrs. C. M. Lee, J. B. Robertson, and Mitchell Loder, are known as 'Hards' or Abolitionists. And it is worthy of remark, that Hon. Jonathan Child, the first Mayor of Rochester, and a prominent 'Silver Gray,' was also present at the meeting; as well as ex-Mayor Richardson, Wm. Brewster, Aaron Erickson, and many other old and substantial citizens, whose faces we have never before seen at a public meeting."

"We have no disposition to dwell at length upon the proceedings of this meeting. The only object we have in referring editorially to them, is to rest, in advance, the imputation, certain to be cast upon the meeting, that it was an Abolition affair; and that, instead, we leave the subject."

The Albany State Register (Silver Gray) says: "There is a deep, settled, and firm determination prevailing every free State of the Union to uphold the Compromise of 1850, and those of 1850. The Whig party are united as one man in this, throughout the free States, and a vast majority of the Democracy are with them on this question. Neither party will consent to an advance of Slavery towards the North. They will be content to leave it where it is, but they will not consent to its further progress."

The Monroe (N. Y.) Democrat says: "A large and influential meeting of the citizens of Syracuse, of all parties, was held in that city on Saturday evening. Mayor McCarthy presided, and speeches were made by several prominent individuals. The following resolution was unanimously adopted: 'Resolved, That we, the citizens of Syracuse, without distinction of party, do unitedly re-nounce and protest against the organization of Nebraska and Kansas under the law now proposed in the Senate of the United States, because it permits a dedication to Slavery of that territory which our fathers consecrated to Freedom.'"

Of the meeting in Towanda, Bradford county, Pa., the Bradford Reporter (Administration party) says: "The meeting held in the Court-House on Tuesday evening last, in pursuance of a call signed by several hundreds of our citizens, of the Whig, Democratic, and Independent Democratic parties, was one of the largest and most respectable ever held in that place. It was distinguished by the earnestness which pervaded the assembly, as if those who had met there to protest against the perpetration of a great wrong were fully sensible of their high duty to their country, and of the serious and weighty business in which they were engaged. There was not so much of the noisy enthusiasm which usually marks political gatherings, as there was of that earnest but determined action which demonstrates the fulness of conviction, and the disposition to express a sense of right."

"Upon no question of public importance has there ever been such unanimity of sentiment as in regard to the proposed repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Its advocates are the exceptions. Even those who have maintained the right of the South to participate in the occupation of Territory, view this proposition with alarm and abhorrence, as a violation of a solemn covenant, and the indication of a disposition to trample under foot all compromises when they are supposed to militate against the free spread of Slavery."

"There is a deep, settled, and firm determination prevailing every free State of the Union to uphold the Compromise of 1850, and those of 1850. The Whig party are united as one man in this, throughout the free States, and a vast majority of the Democracy are with them on this question. Neither party will consent to an advance of Slavery towards the North. They will be content to leave it where it is, but they will not consent to its further progress."

The Monroe (N. Y.) Democrat says: "A large and influential meeting of the citizens of Syracuse, of all parties, was held in that city on Saturday evening. Mayor McCarthy presided, and speeches were made by several prominent individuals. The following resolution was unanimously adopted: 'Resolved, That we, the citizens of Syracuse, without distinction of party, do unitedly re-nounce and protest against the organization of Nebraska and Kansas under the law now proposed in the Senate of the United States, because it permits a dedication to Slavery of that territory which our fathers consecrated to Freedom.'"

Of the meeting in Towanda, Bradford county, Pa., the Bradford Reporter (Administration party) says: "The meeting held in the Court-House on Tuesday evening last, in pursuance of a call signed by several hundreds of our citizens, of the Whig, Democratic, and Independent Democratic parties, was one of the largest and most respectable ever held in that place. It was distinguished by the earnestness which pervaded the assembly, as if those who had met there to protest against the perpetration of a great wrong were fully sensible of their high duty to their country, and of the serious and weighty business in which they were engaged. There was not so much of the noisy enthusiasm which usually marks political gatherings, as there was of that earnest but determined action which demonstrates the fulness of conviction, and the disposition to express a sense of right."

"Upon no question of public importance has there ever been such unanimity of sentiment as in regard to the proposed repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Its advocates are the exceptions. Even those who have maintained the right of the South to participate in the occupation of Territory, view this proposition with alarm and abhorrence, as a violation of a solemn covenant, and the indication of a disposition to trample under foot all compromises when they are supposed to militate against the free spread of Slavery."

Extract of a letter, dated Marlboro', Middlesex co., Mass., Feb. 20, 1854.

"An adjourned meeting has been held at our town hall, this evening, to protest against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. The people are aroused, and woe to the Northern man in Congress that falters. The most conservative Whigs and the most hunker Democrats united in the above meeting with the most determined Free Democrats, and adopted a series of strong resolutions, which are to be sent to the *Era* for publication. The President of the meeting was a Democrat, assisted by two Whig Vice Presidents. All parties felt that a question upon which they can unite, and not all the edicts of Caleb Cushing, or the Administration, can crush out the rising hostility to this gross outrage upon the sacred rights of the North and of Freedom."

Illinois is so much agitated as any other of the free States. The demonstration made in Chicago has been followed in other parts of the State. A few extracts from the newspapers of Illinois will show the temper of the People:

Douglas and the Nebraska Bill.—Being born and reared in the far South, amid all the practical workings of the peculiar institution, we profess to know sufficient of Southern character to venture the assertion, that there is not one Congressman from that region, that is so utterly regardless of pre-existing feelings, and so devoid of all the pure, patriotic feelings and sentiments of the American People, and so essentially mean, traitorous, and dishonorable, as to propose, directly, a bill, to introduce the awful curse of Slavery into a Territory which not only God and all Nature have pronounced free, but also, which the solemn enactments of the American People have long since consecrated to Freedom. But it is human nature, when passion enters, to forget all the noble associations of a long life, draw hard upon an individual, though in many respects worthy, not to scruple to employ an act to do an act, from doing which himself he would shrink with utter horror.—*Illinois Times*.

The Western Press on the Nebraska Bill.—As far as there has been any expression of the press of this State, there are but two papers (the *State Register* and *Quincy Herald*) that have the audacity and presumption to openly advocate the course of Douglas on the Nebraska question.—*Ibid*.

Were the proposition for the repeal of the Compromise of 1850 made openly and above-board, were the plan of throwing open that large tract of country west of Missouri and north of 36° 30' min. to the occupation of Slavery, brought forward as a distinct proposition, they could both be considered with more patience. But a subterfuge and a cheat are made to bare the brute. We are to be coaxed into the support of his measures, under the pretence that we are only applying the principles of 1850, by which we have all agreed to abide. The trick is as shallow as the object is transparent. Slavery to-day exists in Nebraska in defiance of law; its legalization and domestication there are the true objects of the scheme Mr. Douglas has put on foot. We cannot swallow the dose.—*Galena Jeffersonian*, (Democratic).

The object is to introduce Slavery into the new free Territory of Nebraska. The land is free, the soil is unencumbered with no law to bind the slave to his master. On the contrary, the law of Congress, ever since 1850, has shut out and forever prohibited involuntary servitude on this soil. The curse is abolished by the National Legislature for all time to come, so far as the Congress of 1850 had power to effect the great and benevolent object. On this question of Slavery in Nebraska, there is to be no trifling. The North is fixed unalterably, and will tolerate no playing of fast and loose with interests of such magnitude. The Northern man who shall play such games, will sink deeper than plummet ever sounded.—*Belle-ville Advocate*, (Democratic).

The party drill may prove successful, and a sufficient number of votes be secured to carry the measure into effect, but woe to the Northern Senator or Representative who lends his influence to the scheme, and thus re-opens an agitation, the existence of which has been so long condemned by the very men who are now for extending the area of Slavery.—*Peoria Republican*.

First, we cannot concede, as Mr. Douglas assumes, that a refusal to extend the Missouri Compromise line was a violation of that Compromise. There is nothing in the 8th section of the resolutions admitting Missouri into the Union, which even by implication, requires an extension of the line towards the south. Nor is there a provision in this effect in any other Congressional enactment of which we have knowledge. A refusal to extend the line, therefore, cannot in any wise impair or be said to violate the enactment establishing that line.

Secondly, if a quasi violation of the Missouri Compromise in 1848 produced the agitation and sectional animosity of that period, ought not the remembrance of that fact to have furnished our Senator with the strongest possible reason for not advocating a bona fide violation of the same Compromise in 1854?

Thirdly, if it was the part of wisdom and patriotism on the part of Mr. Douglas, in 1848, to advocate the extension of the line to the Pacific, by what rule of logic or of political necessity can it be said to be the part of wisdom or patriotism, in 1854, to advocate the abrogation of the line as originally prescribed.—*Chicago Democratic Press*.

We observe that in our midst a number of petitions are circulating, and are already full of names, remonstrating against the bill of Senator Douglas, which seeks to extend human Slavery over the Territory of Nebraska, contrary to the provisions of the Missouri Compromise. Some of these remonstrances are directed to Congress, and others to our State Legislature, for its action upon the subject. They are signed by almost all, irrespective of party. Now and then some ultra patriots, who really expect to go to Senator Douglas when he declines to sign; but these exceptions, we are glad to be informed, are exceedingly rare.—*Alton Telegraph*.

Senator Douglas's bill for a Territorial organization of this Territory, embracing the principle of Slavery, is exciting the attention and indignation of the whole country north of Mason and Dixon's line. That a Senator representing a free State should thus propose to extend the area of Slavery, and violate a solemn compact made in the Missouri Compromise, is indeed astounding, and fills the lower of Freedom with disgust for the North Carolina slaveholder. But Douglas is just the man capable of such an act.—*Lacon (Ill.) Gazette*.

The Nebraska bill is not meeting with many supporters. It is around the consistent and moderate Anti-Slavery sentiment, saying nothing of the moderate and fanatical. It is a blind statesmanship, at this age of the world, and in this Democratic Government, that would seek out a method by which the extension of slave territory may rest upon a continuity of population over soil which should be forever exempt from the curse.—*Belvidere (Ill.) Standard*.

There are three papers in Massachusetts that advocate the Nebraska bill, viz: The Boston Post, the Lawrence Sentinel, and the Taunton Democrat. The Post is paid with the cream of New England Government pay; the editor of the Sentinel holds an office in the Boston custom-house; and the editor of the Democrat holds a \$2,000 post office. Disinterested patriotism this.—*Chicago Tribune*.

By reference to our telegraphic head, it will be perceived that the Europa has at length arrived; that there has been another decline in breadstuffs; that cotton has slightly advanced; and that the prospect of war is still more lowering. A few facts are indeed stated, upon which a faint hope of conciliation may be based; but the general tenor of the news is far from encouraging such a hope. The disasters and distresses to the respective armies, and to the inoffensive inhabitants of the Principalities, are of a most deplorable character. When we reflect that this wretched war is all done in the name of religion, we cannot but be amazed at the little progress the world has made after the lapse of so long a period since the dark era of the Crusades themselves.

THE MYSTERY EXPLAINED.—A Roman Catholic writer in France furnishes, in the *Univers*, an explanation of the prevalence of spirit-rapping in the United States, to which it is to be hoped due attention will be paid: "Eminent theologians explain why the devil has more liberty in the United States than in Europe, where the holy sacrifices of the mass are celebrated at vast distances apart, and where so many millions of men, descendants of Protestants, have no religion whatever, and are not even baptized. This rarity of the sacraments leaves the devil greater sway over men; he does not come near the earth, not being driven afar by the frequent immolation of the Divine victim, and he enters into communication with the human race by the mysterious means which God leaves open to him."

A CORRESPONDENT.—Mr. Botte's recent letter on the Nebraska bill having been very roughly reviewed in the *Richmond Enquirer*, that gentleman has addressed a note to Mr. R. A. Pryor, one of the editors of that paper, charging him with the authorship of that objectionable article, complaining of its abusive character, and inquiring whether the intent of certain portions of it was to impeach his "personal honor and integrity." Mr. Pryor replies, avowing the authorship of the article, affirming that Mr. Botte's public course on the Nebraska question justified the severity with which it was criticised, but stating that the article was intended only to reflect on Mr. Botte's public course, and not to impeach his honor or integrity. This explanation Mr. Botte accepts as satisfactory, and requests the publication of the correspondence.

THE WAR IN EUROPE.—The *Courier des Etats Unis*, of Thursday morning, publishes a report of a private letter from Paris, in which the following passage occurs: "Here, at Paris, nothing very positive is known in regard to what passed between M. de Kesseloff and M. Drouin de L'Huy, but I am able to affirm that the following course and answers were exchanged between the French and English Governments: 'Immediately after it had received information of the Czar's response, the English Government telegraphed the following despatch to the Tuilleries: "It is agreed that we shall send 30,000 men, and you 50,000. Our 30,000 men are ready—are yours?" The French Government replied: "Our 50,000 men are ready, but not the means of transport." To which Lord Clarendon answered: "We will supply means of transport." This statement differs from the commonly received one as to the number of troops to be sent respectively by the two Governments, but agrees substantially with the report that the English Government had consented to supply something more than men."

The Whig papers in Preston's district, the 7th, of Kentucky, all oppose the Nebraska bill. Close not a letter without reading it, nor drink water without seeing it.

Beautiful marble, susceptible of a high polish, and said to be equal to any of the imported marbles, has lately been discovered in Illinois.

All of the Chicago newspapers, Democratic, Whig, and Free Soil, have come out in opposition to the Nebraska bill.

When the English were good Catholics, they usually drank the Pope's health in a full glass, after dinner; as *non pare*; whence the word bumper.

Some boys at Tahuli, Miss., on the 24th ult., tied crackers to a dog's tail, and the dog ran into a cotton shed, setting fire to the cotton, and causing a loss of \$200,000.

Inconstant activity leads to bankruptcy in strength.

Miss Robinson (Miss Bourgeois) is playing at the Boston Museum.

It is estimated that 9,000 pianos are made every year in the United States.

WHO SUPPORT THE NEBRASKA BILL?

Fairfax, the regular Washington correspondent of the *Richmond Enquirer*, says:

"The President feels a deep interest in the passage of the Nebraska bill, and he fails not to openly express it. The Cabinet also, without a single exception, (I speak positively upon this subject,) is for the bill. Much as he has been said and predicted about the faithfulness of the 'Sobs' in this matter, I believe that, in the end, they will be found more true than the 'Hards.' Whilst Edmund Burke, one of the leading 'Hards,' virtually opposes it, and whilst nearly all the 'Hard' journals in Ohio, and some of them in New York, oppose the bill, many of the authoritative organs of the 'Sots' support it. The Ohio Statesman, in fact, showing that Madison and his wing of the party are true; whilst all the papers in the interest of Allen and his friends oppose it."

Whoever will take the trouble to analyze the foregoing will discover its import to be, that that section of the Democratic party in the North that is now in receipt of the patronage of the General Government is in favor of the President's measure, and that that section that possesses and hopes for no such favor opposes his scheme.

Mr. Crampden, the British Minister, gives a splendid dinner party to-day—having behaved badly on the occasion of Jullien's concert whilst playing the National Quadrille, he is said to be making preparations for a magnificent dinner in honor of Washington's birthday, to make up for his want of propriety on the occasion above alluded to.—*Wash. Co.*

It is easy to start, but hard to stop, the circulation of a mischievous story. On the occasion alluded to, at Jullien's concert, the writer of these lines was present, and he, and others whose words will not be questioned, noticed that there was quite a number of persons besides the British Minister who did not rise during the performance of the national air, and that among them was one member, at least, of the American Cabinet.

The New York Evening Post says that Senator Chase struck, in Congress, the first blow at the Nebraska Bill, and it was a bold and powerful one. No able examination of the whole question has yet appeared.

The clergy do not seem to pay any attention to the plaintive remonstrances of the Washington Union against fanaticism. The Worcester Daily Spy has the following paragraph: "ANTI-NEBRASKA PREACHING.—We learn that most of the preachers in this city disapproved their hearers, on Sunday last, against the contemplated repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Rev. Drs. Hill and Sweetser spoke out in their respective pulpits, as the clergy should speak in a crisis like this. Rev. Dr. Smallwood repeated his discourse of the previous Sabbath, on the same topic, at the Central Church, to a large and sympathizing audience, on Sunday evening; and such was the eagerness of the public to hear that hundreds were unable to obtain admission."

LARGE SALE OF NEGROES.—We learn from the Marlboro' Gazette, that Messrs. George W. and Dr. Roy Carroll, administrators of M. B. Carroll, deceased, sold on Tuesday sixty-seven negroes, belonging to the estate of said deceased. A woman and two infant children sold for \$1,800; a man for \$1,600. The men sold for from \$1,000 to \$1,200 each; boys, 12 to 17 years old, for \$800 to \$900; and women for \$500 to \$1,000. This is the largest sale of negroes held in that county for many years. The gross receipts of the sale amounted to \$37,000. Terms cash, or city acceptance at four months. Port Tobacco (Md.) Times.

Although aware that the largest portion of our readers are not peculiarly interested in the market prices of men, women, and children, we doubt not there are many who will peruse the foregoing with an interest of some kind.

A GREAT DIAMOND.—One of the largest diamonds known was deposited lately at the Bank of England by a London house, to whom it was consigned from Rio Janeiro. Its weight is 254 carats, and its estimated value, according to the scale, \$280,000. It is said to be of the finest water, and without flaw, and was found by a negro slave, who received his freedom as a reward.

If slavery is a blessing and freedom a curse to the negro, why give him "his freedom as a reward?"

The Legislature of Wisconsin have had before them the subject of opening Nebraska to Slavery. Resolutions condemning Douglas's bill, considered and debated in the Wisconsin Assembly, on the 15th inst. Mr. Horn, the Speaker, offered a substitute, affirming the right of slaveholders to enter Nebraska with their property; it was laid on the table. Mr. Knowlton offered another against agitation, and in favor of compromise; it was lost by thirty-four votes to twenty. Since Mr. Douglas and his associates call for agitation, the answer is, let it come. Finally the resolutions passed, to be engrossed, by a vote of forty-seven against twenty-six.

The Pittsburgh Gazette says that the amount at issue in the suits brought in that city, for the violation of the law prohibiting the issue of bank